

Drawing Amendments

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2. This sheet which includes Fig. 1, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 2. In Fig. 2 additional reference symbols "3" were added to show the belts.

Please approve the drawing changes that are marked in red on the accompanying "Annotated Sheet Showing Changes" of Fig. 2. A formal "Replacement Sheet" of amended Fig. 2 is also enclosed.

Attachments:    Replacement Sheet  
                  Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-13 remain in the application. Claims 1-13 have been allowed. Prosecution on the merits has been closed under *Ex parte Quayle*. Claims 9, 12, and 13 have been amended to correct formalistic issues.

It is appreciatively noted from item 2 on page 2 of the Office action that the application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters.

In item 3 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, the drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a).

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that a receiving area of said third singulating section has one more conveyor belt than a transferring area of said second singulating section, in claim 4 must be shown or the features cancelled from the claims. It is noted that the above limitation was shown in Figure 2, as the receiving area of the 3rd singulating section has three belts and the transferring area of the second singulating section has two belts. However, for

clarification purposes, Figure 2 has been changed to provide reference symbols "3" for each of the belts. Therefore, the objection to the drawings by the Examiner has been overcome.

The Examiner stated that with respect to claim 9 that the limitation of the downstream transferring conveyor belt area having one more conveyor belt than said upstream receiving conveyor belt area, must be shown or the feature cancelled from the claims. It is noted that claim 9 had an error and the upstream receiving conveyor should have one more conveyor belt than the downstream transferring region (as in claim 4). Accordingly, claim 9 has been amended so as to correct the error. As seen with respect to comments with respect to claim 4, the above is shown in Fig. 2. Therefore, the objection to the drawings by the Examiner has been overcome.

It is noted that claims 12 and 13 have merely been amended to replace the ";" at the end of the claims with a period.

Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for cosmetic or clarificatory reasons. The changes are not provided for overcoming the prior art nor

2003P16152 - Application No. 10/577,202  
Response to Office action September 15, 2010  
Response submitted December 15, 2010

for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of one month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$130 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

2003P16152 - Application No. 10/577,202  
Response to Office action September 15, 2010  
Response submitted December 15, 2010

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect  
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner  
Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alfred K. Dassler/

Alfred K. Dassler  
Reg. No.: 52,794

AKD:sa

December 15, 2010

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101